

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME VII

DECEMBER 1911

NUMBER 3

Editorial

THE TWO-YEAR LATIN COURSE

In the *School Review* for October Mr. H. F. Scott calls attention to the fact that a two-year Latin course is the normal thing for the majority of Latin pupils in the high schools of the Middle West. It is true that four years of Latin are offered by all good schools; but, because most of the state universities accept two years of Latin for entrance credit, a large proportion of the Latin students plan from the beginning to take only two years in the subject. This offers a convenient excuse for dropping the subject to the half-hearted and discouraged of those who might have gone farther. Consequently the teachers in many schools must face the fact squarely that whatever the great majority of their pupils are to get from Latin they must get from a two-year course. There seems to have been little discussion of the results of this fact.

Mr. Scott is clearly right in urging that we cease to think of the preparatory course as a four-year whole and to plan the first two years as if they were merely a part of that whole. We can no longer, if ever we could, regard those who drop their Latin at the end of two years as mere "quitters," who have no right to be considered in shaping the course. We must plan a two-year course with full appreciation of the fact that it is the whole Latin course for most pupils. We must choose from the ideals and aims of Latin study those which are capable of realization in a two-year course, and must see to it that in the second year those sides of the study are emphasized which will be of permanent value to the pupil, not merely those which will best enable him to go on with his Latin.

But it does not seem certain that such a thoughtful consideration of the two-year course will result in so wide a divergence from the

best present practice as Mr. Scott thinks. While disagreeing as to means and method, we most heartily agree with his fundamental thesis, that the chief benefit to the pupil should be in his better understanding and use of English, and that increased attention should be given to this side of Latin teaching. It is disgraceful that so many of us hold this view in theory and fail to develop it in practice. The two-year course may possibly be of help here; for the teacher who thinks only of the four-year course may justify his failure to teach English in the second year on the ground that he has more than he can do in teaching Latin enough to prepare for the third year, while the teacher who realizes that the second year is his last chance to help the pupil is under no such restriction. But we believe that the same care in teaching English should be given to the four-year pupil as to the two-year, and we urge an improvement in this respect quite without reference to the special needs of two-year pupils.

On the other hand, Mr. Scott thinks that two-year pupils should abandon sight-reading, extended drill in indirect discourse, and all but very simple composition. Again we quite cheerfully agree with him; but we would have those things dropped from the second year of a four-year course as well. Very little sight-reading can be done in the second year, at most, except by the sacrifice of more important things; and sight-reading can hardly be considered the best preparation for third-year work, or even for a sight test. Since there is almost no indirect discourse in Cicero and Vergil, an extended drill in this construction is no preparation for reading those authors; the time might better be spent on more important things. Most second-year composition books are not simple enough.

On the whole, therefore, we see no sufficient reason for Mr. Scott's further suggestion that separate classes be formed for those who are known to be planning to study Latin only two years. On the contrary it seems likely that the interests of all pupils will be best served by planning the second-year work of all as if that year were to be their last, and by striving to give to all alike the utmost of permanent value that can be given in that year. We believe that a determination to do this will be the best result of a consideration of the two-year course.

MINERVA MECHANICA¹

BY HENRY D. WILD
Williams College

Of all modern inventions, the typewriter is perhaps the nearest approach to an artificial mind. Its delicate compactness all but holds the potentialities of thought. It is fairly bursting with alphabetical possibilities, and at times one almost expects to see it in the act of exploding into literature. But luckily, that phenomenon never happens, for it still needs a mind behind it. More than this, if manual skill is lacking, even the most powerful brain makes a bad mess in the use of it. Somewhere in the process the living idea goes to pieces. The larger part of the mental energy is wasted in the mere effort to manage the abominable thing. In such an event the beautiful action of the machine, with the precise thrust of its letter-bars, is chill comfort to the exasperated performer. Rather he has recourse to the inward conviction that no Plato or Vergil or Shakespeare ever poured typewritten masterpieces on the world.

We are at present in the typewriter stage of education. We are all for speed, convenience, technical perfection, immediate results. If only there were co-ordination between the soul of the thing and the process! Aye, there's the rub. The trouble is that we are so absorbed in making it all work that we forget what we set out to do. There is such nervous haste to erase mistakes, to repair breaks, to make fair copy, that there is little time or force calmly to elaborate that which we are frantically striving to express. Method has enwrapped our souls as in a mist. The temper of the twentieth century has penetrated all our institutions of learning, and in the midst of our violent academic leisure we all must have had opportunity to study it. The inevitable conclusion is that the root of the difficulty lies in the fact that, owing to our restless inventiveness, the balance between pure learning on the one hand and the expression of learning on the other has been disturbed, whether in instruc-

¹ Read before the Classical Association of New England at the Sixth Annual Meeting, Exeter, N.H., April 1, 1911.

tion or in creative work. Time was when pure scholarship was wholly out of proportion to its inadequate mechanical means of expression, with the result that the personality of the scholar was its own best expression. Now the relation is reversed, so that the riches of scholarship and the energies of the scholar are drained off through a thousand channels. As Masterman says in his *Condition of England*, "Modern civilization in its most highly organized forms has elaborated a system to which the delicate fiber of mind and body is unable to respond." The state of things was already sufficiently parlous even before a mechanical engineer on a steel foundation investigated our universities and colleges and told us how to run them for efficiency. If this is progress, it is that which Carlyle describes. "If we examine it well," says he, "it is the marching of that gouty patient, whom his doctors had clapt on a metal floor, artificially heated to the searing-point, so that he was obliged to march, and did march with a vengeance—no-whither."

Now it is not enough to say that the classics have been, as by their nature they should be, the last to feel this influence. They, at least, ought not to be subject to the disease at all. They should be the one instance of a wholesome opposition to it though all else fail. If there is anywhere an influence that has its springs in calmness and meditation it is to be found in the classics, and it follows as the night the day that the devotee of the classics must himself be meditative and calm. To be too modern in the presence of the ancient, to use tools on a mental atmosphere, is not only futile, but also a confession that one is not of the elect. "Save the classics at any cost," is the cry, and so we go into action with the rest, elaborate our methods, plan our campaigns, perfect our operations—and hope for the morning. Do we ever stop to think of the misdirection of zeal that strains for the salvage of a force that itself has been a salvation of the centuries?

In view of this universal tendency, of this often admirable activity, one exposes himself to the charge of heresy if he bids his colleagues face square about and do nothing for a time save look up and gain inspiration from the scene above them. Yet I make bold to do precisely this, even to maintain that the real Olympus and Parnassus still rise cool and calm, that the gods and the Muses of old are there undisturbed, and that the better course,

even for our practical ends, is to go up and commune with them. To the possible criticism that this is visionary, it may be replied that it is precisely vision that we need. But I readily yield to the call to come down to the level of facts, on the condition, however, that we appropriate such facts as shall enable us to go up again.

With a view, then, to practical matters, it should be remarked in the first place that we are violating a fundamental rule in that, to use an outdoor expression, we do not "travel light." Too much of our strength is expended on superfluous luggage. A certain amount of impedimenta is necessary, of course, but with the years has come a vast accumulation of it, until what was intended as an aid has become in reality a hindrance. I do not refer to illustrative material that makes the past live again for ourselves and our students. That is our telescope. The wider the sweep of distant scenery at our command the better. Nor do I mean those aids in the way of reference and of information that localize our work. They are our guidebooks. The results of the labors of field experts must be had and used at any cost. The more of the true sort the better. But why is it that we find so many of our students "seraphically free from taint of personality"? Thomas Arnold used to say: "I call that the best theme which shows that the boy has read and thought for himself; that the next best which shows that he has read several books and digested what he has read; and that the worst which shows that he has followed one book and followed that without reflection." What would Arnold do today with some of our school editions where Vergil and Cicero lie neatly concealed beneath a mass of annotative gelatin? In four school editions of Latin authors, taken at random, the total number of pages of text is 709, while the number of pages of notes is 795. In four college editions of Latin authors, taken at random with the exception of one where the editor's notorious zeal afforded a temptation to fatten statistics too great to be resisted, there is a total of 374 pages of Latin text to 860 pages of notes, exclusive of introductions. It is this sacrificing of the great original on the altar of great originality that is a bane of our modern training in the classics. It is an open question if our fathers, with all their poverty of extraneous "helps," did not get closer to that essence that had "some relish of salvation in 't.'" From the nature of things, how can a

student with a given amount of time at his disposal get into the heart of an author's thought and style, when it is expected of him that in the attempt to do so he must spend a large fraction of that time in familiarizing himself with Professor Blank's ideas on the subjunctive? In that time he might have memorized ten verses of the *Aeneid*, and if only ten, even so to his everlasting good. It is no wonder that the average student comes to eschew these condiments altogether, and bolts his daily food almost whole, with certain easily obtainable dilutions to wash it down; in which case it is better for him to hold in his hand twelve books of solid *Aeneid* than six books plus an equal bulk of what to him is nothing but waste paper. For my part, I confess to a strong tendency toward reaction in this matter. Better results are obtained, I feel convinced, by an immediate approach to the original text. This is not a plea for the wholesale abandonment of annotated editions for the classroom. They are useful just in so far as they lead directly to the end in view, the mastery of the authors. Many editions might be named whose notes are in themselves a literary delight and make needed trails leading straight to the fountain instead of bristling brushwood around it. But, in the last analysis, it is the teacher's business to teach, to be his own bureau of information to his classes, and not to conduct a daily examination on a mass of notes. It is with something like this in mind that, as a part of their reading, we have this year placed in the hands of our Freshmen Mackail's little book, *The Hundred Best Latin Poems*, with not an English word to mar the fair Latin, save on the title-page and in the Preface. Each instructor gives such comments on the daily assignments as he sees fit. The result is a sense of real teaching and learning matched on common ground, and of a certain fine excitement among the students, as of the first-hand discovery of poets. The great gift of classical training is the development in the student of the power of reasoning, of interpretative analysis, and of critical judgment. It is better that for the time he should form erroneous judgments and reach false conclusions in matters of detail, provided he does so as a result of his own thinking, than that he should appropriate second-hand truth like an automaton. Furthermore, it is the function and privilege of the teacher, not of the editor, to lead him to correct opinions and to mark the way

through difficulties. Jealously to conserve this right is the teacher's duty not only to himself but to those committed to his instruction.

We may well go farther and extend our revolt against mechanical "helps" that become mechanical clogs to our personal acquisition as teachers. As interpreters of the classics and of their spirit the great essential is that we come ourselves into priestly touch with our source of inspiration. To do this we must first go in alone. Nor is it an insuperable objection to indulgence of this kind, even in the case of those who are handicapped by a New England conscience in its worst form, that, after all, it is what one would most like to do. What teacher of literature in some weary and reckless hour has not thrown to the winds papers and marks and commentaries and all pestiferous machinery, probably with the firm belief that he was doing a selfish thing, and permitted himself a debauch of reading in some author, only to find that next day and for many days he has made ample atonement for his neglect of business by his increased enthusiasm? Among the most valuable words spoken at the meetings of this association were those of Professor Seymour at our first gathering in Springfield, when he urged us to steep ourselves, all paraphernalia aside, in our Greek and Latin. It is well to refresh our minds, too, with Macaulay's definition of a scholar: "A scholar is one who reads Plato with his feet on the fender."

But the presence of superfluous impedimenta is only one phase of a tendency that reveals itself still more widely in what we are pleased to call method and system. Method is not unessential. But by its very nature it postulates an end to be reached, and the voluntary strain toward an end never passes into involuntary power, especially if, as is likely to happen, method comes to be emphasized as the *summum bonum* of the process. Here again classical instruction in this country has been drawn within the sweep of the general error. This is the sixth annual meeting of this association. An examination of the programs of the first five meetings lends corroboration to my point. Of a total of 61 papers read only 13, or 21 per cent, were on distinctly literary topics; 15 are best listed under the head of miscellaneous, while 33, or 54 per cent of the whole, were on subjects connected with technique and methods. Unhappily for my statistics, but happily for my peace of mind, the present program does not aid my argu-

ment. Important as are the mechanical details of teaching, they can and do settle themselves before a rush of enthusiasm for the thing that is taught. It is on the motionless log-jam that the river-men are always busiest with their cant-hooks. On the principle that our gatherings by their tone must indicate our state of mind, it may not be wide of the mark to say that it would be a perfectly natural thing, rather the expected thing, for a group of people engaged in the teaching of literature to put their annual opportunity for intercourse to a literary use, with a view to gaining mutual help through an exchange of new knowledge from all portions of their field and from the common study of authors. Perhaps, on our return from such an event we should not deplore overmuch that for once we had discussed our authors to a greater extent than how to teach them. They would be more likely thereafter to teach themselves.

The evils arising from a large elaboration of methods are subjective and objective. Subjectively, or as regards the teacher, technique is a personal, in some respects an incommunicable, thing wrought out of individual experience and adapted to local conditions. The methods that work perfectly with one may fatally hamper another. Objectively also, or as concerns the pupil, technique is necessarily localized and individualized, and in any case it should be submerged. Otherwise we have the precious product deliciously portrayed by Arbuthnot in his *Martin Scriblerus*. The pedantic father taught his son geography by giving him a geographical suit of clothes, and geometry by drawing parallel lines on his bread and butter. "But," the record states, "what most conduced to Cornelius' attainment of Greek was his love of gingerbread, which his father caused to be stamped with the letters of the Greek alphabet; and the very first day the child ate as far as Iota."

On the other hand, and still with reference to the student, are we fully alive to the dynamics of the classics when allowed to play directly on the mind of youth? As I see it, our main task is not to manipulate this power, but rather to march the student straight up to the circle of it. Every one of us must have received his surprise at some time or other, when, after all the batteries of method had been exhausted in vain on some pachydermatous pupil, the latter had been awakened gradually to life by the light working its own way with him without aid or interference. It may be charged that this too is

method, but if it is then it is method of the direct and primal kind that in reality is a process of Nature, and against such there is no law.

Whatever its phases, the disease is a fundamental restlessness. We seem incapable of following a consistent line of action for any length of time. Something is wrong, nobody knows what—well then, find out by tinkering: put a new bolt here, another shaft there; remove this screw; try a new lubricator. But the fatal fact is that every change involves ten other changes, each experimental like the last. It is far from my thought to decry progress; my whole plea is for the higher progress that comes with calm thinking and the fitting of forces to new conditions. New methods are good, provided they are the natural outgrowth of the central energy instead of excrescences on the periphery. To take an example, the new Latin entrance requirements are most welcome for this very reason. Those who have been mainly responsible for this reform have performed a great service to the cause of the study of Latin, and all the more so because of their firm opposition to capricious and individual attempts to better an average good. Just as I would prefer to have a boy of mine receive four years of consistent instruction under one second-rate master than the same amount under a succession of four first-rate masters changing annually, so I prefer an imperfect system perfectly tried to incessant agitation to attain the so-called "perfect." Somewhere and somehow there must be a sense of confidence and repose. There is such a thing as endowment through permanence.

The feeling of security in our classical heritage is half the battle. Its dignity and its strength are as great as ever. It is now what it has always been—calm and deep and rich, the embodied antithesis to the noisy, the superficial, and the mechanical. The classics, even Greek, have not yet "gone to the tomb of all the Capulets." But we have been so busy striving to adjust them to the times that we have forgotten that they are self-adjusted to all times. There is a reasonable hope for them, as for all pure learning, when her votaries shall have enthroned the Minerva of old—

From his awful head

Whom Jove brought forth in warlike armor drest,
Golden, all radiant . . .

in place of a puppet-goddess worked by strings.

OUR FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE

[As announced editorially in the October *Journal*, we take pleasure in presenting herewith a communication from our English correspondent, Mr. W. E. P. Pantin.]

MY DEAR SIR: You have done me the honor of asking me to write a letter for the *Classical Journal*, and it is a pleasure to comply with your invitation. For I feel that I owe a great deal to American scholars and especially, but by no means exclusively, to Professor Gildersleeve; and it is a satisfaction in such matters to record one's sense of obligation. I think my best plan will be to write without much method about any topic connected with the study of the classics which happens to interest me, in the hope that it may also interest your readers.

When one looks back over the last twelve months one naturally thinks first of the loss which classical studies have sustained by the death of Mr. S. H. Butcher. I need not attempt to say anything of his work as a scholar and a teacher, for it is, I believe, widely known in America as well as in England. But perhaps it is not so generally known how widespread was his personal influence. He had worked at Cambridge, Oxford, Edinburgh; he was intimately acquainted with the Irish universities; he was for many years chairman of the Council of the Classical Association. Hence he knew a very large number of the teachers of classics in all parts of the kingdom and his advice was constantly sought when any important appointment was to be made. There was a large study built out at the back of his house in Tavistock Square near the British Museum. He most hospitably allowed this room to be used for the meetings of the Council and various committees of the Classical Association. It was while working on some of these committees that I spent many a strenuous Saturday afternoon at his house and came to know him a little. And it was a real privilege to know him even slightly. His courtesy was so fine a quality, it was the expression of an intellect and character so rare that one could not be with him without being the better for it. I remember a colleague of mine saying to me, after a general meeting of the Classical Association, "What a treat it is to see Butcher preside!"

It was indeed a pleasure to see with what perfect tact he would keep the discussion going, and how he would intervene when necessary with a few remarks which would throw a new light on the subject and help the meeting forward to a new point of view. Let me quote here from the newspaper report of the commemorative address which Professor Gilbert Murray delivered at a meeting of the Royal Society of Literature:

Professor Butcher, he said, was clear and decided in his views, but he met his opponents with a generous understanding which amounted almost to sympathy. But there was also something purely personal which defied analysis; a curious blend of distinction and friendliness, of sincerity and almost deferential courtesy. He made you feel that he meant just what he said, and was able to speak frankly because he had no shadow of ill-feeling behind; that the singular Irish charm which was a second nature to him was never for a moment used to hide a maneuver or to push a concealed purpose.

I pass on to speak of another scholar lately dead, a man of a very different type, F. W. Walker. As high-master, first of Manchester Grammar School, then of St. Paul's, he produced so many eminent scholars that I think some inquiry as to how he achieved his success will be both profitable and interesting to the readers of the *Classical Journal*. Though circumstances are different at different times and in different countries, the problem that lies before the teacher, the difficulties which waylay the scholar are much the same. By way of introduction let me quote from an article by Mr. R. F. Cholmeley (now head-master of Owen's School, Islington), who served under Walker for many years and played no small part in the development of the school:

He was high-master of St. Paul's from 1876 to 1905. It was a great foundation of more than respectable history, which was doing very little work. Its tradition favored scholarship in the masters, independence in the boys. The school was bound to come away from St. Paul's Churchyard, but it was Mr. Walker who saw the possibilities of a suburban day school and resisted the temptation to add another to the great country boarding-schools which he regarded as mere imitation of Eton. He had no fancy for ruling a school in which learning would be in the second or third place, and the head-master would have to share the government with the boys. He believed in government and he believed in learning; not that he was indifferent to character, but he thought that it was more likely to be developed along the right lines by industry which he understood, than by athletics which he never professed to understand. He weighed the

advantages and disadvantages of all courses, and when he had made up his mind he was not to be moved by the objections to the course he had chosen. In the six years that he spent under the shadow of the Cathedral he made certain of the future. What that future was to be is partly written in the scholarship lists of Oxford and Cambridge. Between 1891 and 1900 five Paulines became fellows of Trinity, Cambridge; between 1882 and 1905 there were only three years in which no Pauline won a Foundation Scholarship at that college; in eleven years Paulines carried off seven Chancellor's Medals, four Browne's Medals, three Smith's Prizes, and a Porson. In sixteen years twenty of his boys won scholarships or exhibitions at Balliol; the Derby Scholarship was won five times, the Ireland five times; there were eight Hertfords and twelve Cravens, seven Gaisford Prizes and six Chancellor's Medals. It was no wonder if men of other schools denounced the high-master of St. Paul's as a scholarship-hunter; and it may be admitted that he was not concerned to refute them. He believed in Latin and Greek; he wanted scholarships because his boys needed them, because he wanted scholars to teach, because he wanted his school to be a place of learning and to be famous as such. If it be asked what were the qualities which enabled him to succeed, the answer is not difficult to find. Some of them were qualities such as a schoolmaster is expected to possess, some were not. He could never have done what he did if he had not been a great scholar, and his scholarship was respected wherever the meaning of scholarship was understood, though he seldom wrote a line. The man who could say reflectively between two puffs of a cigar, "Jowett knew no Greek," had need to be accurate in his scholarship, and his accuracy was monstrous. If anyone questioned him about it, he probably said that it was due to the number of times that he read Gibbon through before he was sixteen and few men have owed more to capacity for hard reading. Next in importance to his own scholarship was his unerring eye for a scholar. It is true that he spent much of his time in looking for scholars. He invented a system which enabled him to give such time as he could spare for teaching to a number of the younger boys, and he taught them elementary Latin and Greek with a minute carefulness which not many of them forgot, and some masters had occasion to remember, if he came across an exercise which had been imperfectly corrected; but even so, the rightness of his judgment was very remarkable. It was not inspiration, it was a persistent determination to get at the facts, and this respect for facts distinguished all that he did and made him a fine teacher not only of boys but of men. . . .

It might be supposed that a man so determined to be master in his own house would be a difficult chief. He was not; in the last years of his high-mastership he was sometimes harassed and impatient; but in his best years—and there were many of them—he was as nearly an ideal chief as any assistant master is likely to find. He could not endure incompetence; but he was a generous judge of men, and when once he had made up his mind that a man was worth something he gave a remarkable measure of freedom, and was even

tolerant of eccentricities which would have been the despair of a weaker head. Despot he undoubtedly was, yet not so much from any sense of personal superiority as because he thought it his business to be one. He was not always fair; he wanted one thing—efficiency—and he wanted that one thing so much that he cared little what weapon he used upon anyone who got in the way of it.¹

Walker always knew from the beginning exactly what he was aiming at. He believed in a classical education as being the best education that could be given: "You cannot get an education which widens the mind more," he would say, "and is more truly liberal, than one which compels you to cast your ideas into the language and thought of another age." Yet he was under no illusions as to its positive value; I remember his saying: "Not *very* good, perhaps, but a man must be very clever to devise a better. It has the experience of the race behind it. Every nation has educated its best minds on the culture of a past age. The Greeks were brought up on Homer, as no other literature but their own was available to them; the Romans on the literature of Greece." He would tell us that what we had to make for was not the ideally best, but the best obtainable under the circumstances. And finding this in a classical education he turned the whole force of his intellect to making the instrument as perfect as possible. Not that he neglected other studies; under his rule St. Paul's produced many distinguished mathematicians. But classics was always the chief subject, and he took care that his best mathematicians should not be onesided.

If asked by what method he produced his scholars, I should reply: First, by influencing his masters. Partly of deliberate purpose in order to make them work at their subject, partly from pure interest in the subject itself, he was always talking about language. Little points of grammar and idiom never lost their interest for him, "I wonder if that's Latin," he would say, "I wish you'd look it up." And one would go and look it up in Merguet's *Cicero Lexicon*, and jot down all the examples one could find. "There's an article on the use of the participles in Greek in *A.J.P.* a few years back; just read it and see if you are right in that

¹ From *The Guardian*, December 16, 1910.

sentence." Or, "Oh, I thought you knew that; I'll show you so-and-so's paper in *Wölfflin's Archiv*. You'd better read it." And one always did read it. Mr. Cookson, now vice-principal of Magdalen College, Oxford, who took the Latin of the highest forms, happily describes him in his relations with his staff as "a scholar who stimulated, goaded, or shamed them into the love of learning for its own sake."

He inspired such confidence by his personality and his intellectual force that one never questioned that the line of work in which he started one was the right one. Mr. Cyril Bailey, now fellow and tutor of Balliol, writes: "I remember well in my last year but one coming back from an unsuccessful attempt to win a scholarship; the high-master said nothing to me but: 'you must read Theocritus.' I not only read Theocritus, but I was perfectly confident that it would prove an unfailing path to success."

Owing to this stimulating influence he always had on his staff a large number of men who were continually "wondering if that's Latin," men living in close contact with their subject, and consequently teaching with more conviction and greater freshness. It is interesting to consider how this spirit of inquiry affected the teaching. Directly, it had an effect on the quality of the Latin and Greek taught. Boys learned to write a more idiomatic Greek and Latin than is usual at an early stage. They learned, too, quite early to see fine distinctions and to get accustomed to hard thinking. But the indirect effect, though less visible, was far greater. Men working under Walker took far more pride in their work than most men do in elementary teaching. We felt we were engaged in some great enterprise; we attached more importance than men usually do to the teaching of the lower forms.

A quotation will show that the same spirit prevailed in the teaching at the top of the school. One of Mr. Walker's most distinguished pupils writes thus of Mr. Frank Carter (now a master at Winchester College), who took the highest forms in Greek: "One quality of Mr. Carter's teaching was as valuable as it is rare. He seemed to be setting out on a joint inquiry with his form, on which both he and they had to collaborate to achieve a result which when achieved was the product of their combined labors. This method

gave to schoolboys a feeling that they were not merely being taught foregone conclusions, but were scholars adding something to the store of classical knowledge."

Mr. Walker wrote little himself, but he did much to stimulate those under him to write and to set a high standard before themselves. "You should write something for your own self-respect," he would say, and speak of "using the golden hours of the night from nine to one." Many books which will be known to readers of the *Classical Journal* owed much to his suggestion, encouragement, and advice; for example, Rutherford's *New Phrynicus*, King and Cookson's *Sounds and Inflections in Greek and Latin*, Rice Holmes's *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul* and *Ancient Britain*. And the fact that members of the staff wrote books which have achieved the reputation of these naturally led boys to respect their masters and emulate their scholarships.

So far, as to the direct effect on the masters. In talking of his influence on them I have anticipated a good deal of what I might have said as to his influence on the boys. After his first few years at St. Paul's he did not take regular form-work, and his influence in the upper forms was chiefly felt through the masters.

But he took part in the teaching of the special class [I quote again from Mr. Coutts-Trotter's excellent paper in *Res Paulinae*, a collection of papers relating to the history of the school in the last fifty years] coming in and going out as he chose, and a word must be said of this institution which, so far as the writer knows, is peculiar to St. Paul's. The "special" contained two groups of boys; those who had just entered the school, and those who were in process of transition from one part of it to another. They sat in the Great Hall and they wrote exercises of various kinds—Arnold, Clivus, and the like—by themselves, and they received individual and not class teaching. Mr. Walker would go round and examine these exercises, and thus, at the very start of a boy's school career, he had an opportunity of forming a judgment as to his abilities.

The general aim of the teaching in the "special" was to give the boys complete facility in the use of the commoner words, inflections, and constructions, and this was attained by putting them through a large number of exercises, both prose and verse. Any sentences done wrong were rewritten as soon as they had been corrected; and if there were many mistakes the exercises were then done afresh, so that the correct version was the one which remained in the boy's

mind. Such a practice is supposed to be dull, but Walker never had any difficulty in making the boys believe in the system. A writer in the *Classical Journal* for January quotes Friederich Paulsen "to the effect that it is not work which causes overfatigue so much as the lack of conscious progress." That is it: a boy felt he was getting on, and I have known many distinguished scholars speak with enthusiasm of their time in the "special."

Walker made little of translation till a boy had attained considerable command of the language; he had no belief in the view that you should begin to read an author at an early stage, and pick up the language as you go. Mr. Coutts-Trotter expresses his attitude very clearly as follows:

Mr. Walker incumbered himself with very few general theories either about education as a whole or classical education in particular; but one that he held firmly was that before a boy was fit for the higher classical work the rudiments must become almost mechanical to him. "It is too great a strain," he would say. "How can a boy do Latin prose if he has to use his brain to think of a gender or a construction?" He gave it as his experience that intellectual break-downs at the university almost always occurred among those who began learning the classics late; and to whom accordingly the purely linguistic side of scholarship was always a conscious effort of the intellect or memory, and never purely mechanical.

Another distinguished pupil of Mr. Walker's, Mr. Laurence Binyon, of the British Museum, writes as follows:

Passing up the School [after a time in the Special class] I came but little under his immediate notice; but I had already learnt one lesson from his inspiration—the power to work thoroughly at the thing in hand, the secret of concentration. And throughout my time I felt this in the organization of our work. To be enabled, by our system of reading Homer or Virgil in great stretches at a time continuously, to gain such ease and speed that the finest of literature could be absorbed in its fulness and energy with a natural enjoyment, this was a precious boon—a splendid discipline and lasting delight—for which I am ever grateful.

I hope I may be forgiven for writing at such length of the work of a single scholar. My excuse is that there are certain ideas concerning the study and teaching of the classics which seem to me to be of interest and importance and which are connected in my mind with F. W. Walker. I hope they may prove interesting to

others, and not the less interesting from the fact that they were put in practice on a large scale.

I am very much interested to see from your February number that you are moving in the matter of uniformity of grammatical terminology. As many readers of the *Classical Journal* probably know, the subject has recently been considered by a committee in this country and the final *Report*, the result of two years' very hard work, was published in July (John Murray, price 6d). The names of Professor E. A. Sonnenschein (the chairman), Professor R. S. Conway (the secretary for 1909), Dr. W. H. D. Rouse, and Mr. F. G. Thompson will show that the classics were well represented. The committee may, at least, claim to have done two things. It has called attention to a defect in our present practice and has pointed a way to its removal. Teachers and writers of school books will be able to turn to the *Report* and find a carefully considered terminology with which to compare their own. A man may find himself unable to accept *all* its recommendations, but probably the majority will find themselves in agreement with most of them. As the matter is of interest to your readers I will quote two passages from the *Report*:

The result of the Committee's deliberations has been to confirm its belief in the possibility and the desirability of the reform contemplated. It was found that although differences of opinion manifested themselves on particular points of grammatical doctrine, there was on the whole a large agreement on fundamental matters; nor did any cleavage arise between teachers of ancient languages on the one hand and teachers of modern languages on the other. Most of the resolutions of the committee have been reached either unanimously or by substantial majorities. . . .

It is the hope of the committee that the terminology suggested in the present *Report* will be widely adopted, by teachers, by writers of schoolbooks, and by examining bodies, as a standard terminology for the fundamental facts of grammar. The committee, however, recognizes that, in dealing with special points of grammar which arise in connection with more advanced work, teachers and writers of textbooks will find it necessary to supplement this standard terminology by additional terms not inconsistent with those here presented.

Yours faithfully,

W. E. P. PANTIN

ST. PAUL'S SCHOOL
WEST KENSINGTON, LONDON, W.
September 9, 1911

ARCHAEOLOGY IN 1910

PART II

BY GEORGE H. CHASE
Harvard University

At Delos, during June and July, the French devoted a short campaign to completing the excavation of the sanctuaries of the Egyptian and the Syrian gods, of which the greater part was laid bare in 1909, and to examining the region between these precincts and the Inopus. In the course of the work, many inscriptions which throw light on the history of the two sanctuaries were recovered, and near the Inopus a new sanctuary of Egyptian gods came to light. It is identified by dedicatory inscriptions to Serapis, Isis, Anubis, Ammon, and Artemis Phosphoros, and appears to be earlier in date than the sanctuary which was known before. The appearance of the first two parts of a definitive publication of the excavations at Delos, under the title *Exploration archéologique de Délos*, should have been noted in last year's report. May the later parts appear more rapidly than the *fascicules* of the *Fouilles de Delphes*!

At Athens the most striking discoveries of the year were undoubtedly those made by Mr. Hill, the director of the American School, and by Mr. Dinsmoor, our Fellow in Architecture on the Carnegie Foundation. Mr. Hill's discoveries have to do with the "Earlier Parthenon," that is, the temple which was in process of erection at the time of the Persian invasion. By a very careful study of the foundation of the present Parthenon, together with some excavation inside the building and about the north wall of the Acropolis, he showed that a large number of blocks of the steps and the stylobate of the older temple, as well as parts of the moulding at the base of the cella wall, are still *in situ*, and identified as parts of the Earlier Parthenon a number of blocks scattered about the Acropolis or built into the north wall, which have not before been associated with the building. On the basis of this new evidence, he was able to prove conclusively that the older temple

had six columns on the ends and sixteen on the sides, not eight and nineteen, as Dr. Dörpfeld had argued. The completeness of his proof is shown by the fact that Dr. Dörpfeld himself at once accepted Mr. Hill's conclusions. One curious by-product of the work was the discovery, below the pavement of the present Parthenon, of a number of skeletons, the bodies, presumably, of bishops of Athens, placed here in the mediaeval period, when the Parthenon served as a church.

Mr. Dinsmoor's discovery grew out of his work on the western slope of the Acropolis, and had to do with the choragic monument of Nicias. The original position of this monument, many blocks of which are built into the so-called Beulé Gate, has long been a matter of dispute. The most generally accepted theory in recent years has been that advanced by Dr. Dörpfeld in 1889, which placed the building on certain foundation walls just northeast of the Odeum of Herodes. More recently, Mr. F. Versakes, a Greek archaeologist, had argued that the building must have been erected near the great theater, in the precinct of Dionysus. A careful study of the blocks in the Beulé Gate and other fragments scattered about the Acropolis (some of which he identified for the first time) convinced Mr. Dinsmoor that the monument stood on a foundation just south of the east end of the Stoa of Eumenes. By careful computation he proved, to his own satisfaction, that the dimensions of this foundation were precisely those which are demanded by the blocks of the entablature, but, to make assurance doubly sure, he undertook the complete excavation of the foundation and discovered, lying on one of the walls, two fragments of moulding exactly similar to two of the mouldings on the blocks in the Beulé Gate. With the help of the foundation walls, the form of the building can be restored with practical certainty, and Mr. Dinsmoor has published his restoration, together with an account of his investigations, in the *American Journal of Archaeology* for 1910, pp. 459-84. Thus one more problem of Athenian topography has been definitely settled, and the reputation of the American School for careful, accurate work, which was already great, has been enhanced.

At the open meeting of the school at which Mr. Hill described

his study of the Earlier Parthenon, Dr. Elderkin, the secretary, proposed an interesting theory in regard to the northwest wing of the Propylaea, the so-called Pinakothek. Briefly stated, Dr. Elderkin's theory is that the irregularity in the position of the door and the windows in the Pinakothek is due to the fact that they were planned to be seen from a definite point in the ascent to the Acropolis, from which they would appear symmetrical with the columns; this would presumably be the point where this part of the Propylaea first came into full view. To me it seems doubtful if this is the true explanation, but the theory caused considerable discussion, and like Mr. Hill's investigations, it shows how many problems still remain to be solved even in the study of such familiar monuments as those on the Acropolis.

Finally, Dr. Johnson, the Fellow of the Institute, in examining a late foundation wall on the Acropolis, discovered three inscriptions, one of which is of exceptional interest. It is a fragment of a treasure list of the year 371 B.C. In it Glaucon is named as secretary of the Board of Treasurers for 371-370 B.C., and among the objects listed is an elaborate sword (*άκινάκης*), which is doubtless the very sword that Demosthenes (xxiv. 129) accuses Glaucon, *ταμεύσας ἐν ἀκροπόλει*, of having stolen. After this lucky discovery, Dr. Johnson asked for permission to examine the wall further, but this was refused by the Greek officials, who propose to examine it themselves—a proceeding which smacks more of Italy than of Greece.

The restoration of the Propylaea has gone steadily forward; the workmen are now engaged in building up the western portico.

In the bastion of Cimon, Mr. R. Heberdey discovered a new fragment of the Nike balustrade, and in the two museums on the Acropolis he identified several other pieces of this monument, which have now been put together.

Outside of the Acropolis several excavations were conducted by the Greek Society. Northwest of the hill, on the site of the Bouleuterion, a number of interesting finds were made, including a marble head of the fifth century, of the type of the "Apollo on the Omphalos." On the Pnyx, excavations about the retaining wall of the assembly-place produced vase fragments of the fifth century

and stamped amphora handles of the fourth. Apparently, therefore, this wall cannot be earlier than the fourth century. Inside the present wall, however, was found an older wall of smaller stones, which is, undoubtedly, the wall of the fifth century. Unfortunately, no evidence was discovered which would fix the exact date of its construction. Near the "Theseum," in the excavations undertaken to determine the site of the agora, were found a well-preserved portico, consisting of two pillars of Pentelic marble three meters high, the torso of a beautiful statue of Apollo, identified by Mr. Oikonomos as the "Apollo Patrou" of Euphranor mentioned by Pausanias (i. 3. 3), and several reliefs and inscriptions.

In the outer Ceramicus, the work of clearing the Street of Tombs was carried further under Professor Brückner's direction, with the intention of restoring the roadway, so far as possible, to its condition in the fourth century B.C. It is even proposed to remove the chapel of Hagia Triada, so long the most conspicuous landmark of this region, so that the exploration of this district may be completed. Among the minor discoveries is a terminal stone inscribed ABATON, which is thought to mark the inclosure in which ostracism was pronounced. Ten potsherds inscribed with the name of Thucydides, son of Melesias, were found, and twenty with the name of Cleippides, son of Deinias. The site of the sanctuary of the Tripatores, identified by several terminal stones, was also found.

At Colonus, Mr. Svoronos investigated the topography of the hill of Colonus Hippius and discovered, below the foundations of a small modern house, the chasm in the sanctuary of the Erinnies, in which the scene of Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus* is laid. This gave him a clue to the identification of other precincts in the vicinity, and the most interesting result of his study is the proof that Sophocles was topographically accurate in all his descriptions of places. Thus the altar of Poseidon and the Plutoneum were found to correspond exactly with the descriptions in the drama. Svoronos also succeeded in determining the site of the Academy and in locating the road which led to it from Athens.

In northern Greece, Messrs. Thompson and Wace of the British School, continuing their work on the early settlements, excavated

two tumuli in Thessaly, one at Tsanglí, about half way between Phersala and Velestino, and the other at Rachmáni, between Larissa and Tempe. Comparing their results at these sites with the data obtained in earlier excavations, the explorers now distinguish four prehistoric periods in Thessaly: (1) Neolithic I, characterized by red-on-white painted pottery; (2) Neolithic II, with pottery such as was found at Dimini; (3) Chalcolithic; (4) Early Bronze Age, with unpainted pottery. The latter part of the Early Bronze Age is synchronous with the Late Minoan II and III periods. In the tumulus at Tsanglí, numerous remains of houses were found, belonging to the Neolithic I period, and exhibiting, in one case, traces of three successive buildings. The latest of them showed a well-developed rectangular plan, with traces of a row of wooden posts down the middle and a pair of curious interior walls or buttresses at each interior angle. The small finds included vases, celts, and terra-cotta figurines. At Rachmáni was found a house of the Chalcolithic period, containing specimens of a new type of pottery with paint laid on so thickly as to form a sort of incrustation, a large store of carbonized wheat, peas, lentils, figs, and other vegetables, and four human figures with bodies of terra-cotta and heads of painted stone—a sort of anticipation of the acrolithic sculpture of classical times.

In Thessaly, too, Dr. Arvanitopoulos continued his explorations at Pagasae and attacked two new sites. At Pagasae he recovered about one hundred new painted stelae, some of them in an excellent state of preservation; at Laspochorion, just beyond the eastern end of the Vale of Tempe, he opened a number of tombs of the geometric period, and near them found the acropolis of ancient Homolium and a temple site with many remains of architecture and inscribed stones; and at Gonnos, at the foot of Mount Olympus, he discovered a round temple of Athena, together with many inscriptions. In the ruins of the temple were found some fragments of the statue of the goddess, one of which is inscribed with the name Xenocles, the maker or the dedicatory of the image. Only a very brief report of these discoveries has been published, but they must be of considerable importance, for the local authorities have decided to build a museum for the reception of the finds.

In the Peloponnesus, the Americans and the Germans continued their excavations at Corinth and at Tiryns, respectively; the English brought their work at Sparta to a close; the French examined more carefully the temple of Athena Alea at Tegea; the Austrians explored the ruins of the city of Elis; and the Greeks conducted small excavations at a number of points.

The campaign at Corinth was again devoted principally to the region about Pirene. North of the fountain were found the colonnades which complete the rectangular court (the *περιβολος* of Pausanias ii. 3. 3), and northeast of the court a small fountain came to light, which received the overflow from Pirene. The basin of this fountain is inside a building which is roofed with a corbeled vault of heavy blocks and suggests a comparison with the "galleries" in the walls of Tiryns. In the excavations at this point, many fragments of neolithic and geometric vases were found, and as the spring is a natural one, it seems not unlikely that the fountain-house was built by the prehistoric inhabitants and only later connected with Pirene. In the theater some further digging was done, and more seats of the Greek building were found in place, buried in the foundations of the diazoma of the Roman theater.

At Tiryns, the Germans devoted their attention principally to the western part of the palace, to the rooms about the bathroom and the western side of the court. It was found that the later palace (the palace excavated by Schliemann) underwent several rebuildings, which can be approximately dated, and some evidence was found for placing the famous alabaster frieze not high up under the roof but about on a level with the eye. More important was the discovery of a large number of fragments of painted plaster, partly from the earlier and partly from the later palace, many of which could be pieced together. Among the subjects are parts of a procession of warriors armed with spears; a procession of women with vessels of different kinds in their hands, probably from the decoration of a corridor; and, most interesting of all, a hunting scene, in which boars and other animals are being driven into nets by dogs and there despatched with spears. This was evidently an elaborate composition, containing not only the hunt itself, but men and women in chariots who approached the hunting party.

from either side. The few specimens which have been published (*Athenische Mitteilungen*, XXXVI, 1911, pp. 198-206, and Plate VIII) show that these are among the most important wall-paintings that have been discovered, and the publication of the rest will be eagerly awaited.

At Sparta the English excavators, in their short final campaign, dug principally on the hill where the Menelaion was explored in 1909, and uncovered the remains of a large number of houses dating from the end of the Mycenaean period. All were much destroyed by erosion, and few small finds were made, but the best-preserved house yielded some fine vases and an interesting series of lumps of clay which had been used as stoppers for wine jars. These had been baked hard in the fire which destroyed the house, and had preserved not only the impressions of the seals with which they had been stamped, but also the marks of the rushes by which they were fastened and the vine leaves by which the wine was protected when the clay was placed in the mouths of the jars. Nothing of later date than the Bronze Age was found, and it seems clear that this hill marks the principal prehistoric settlement in the Spartan plain, which was destroyed at the beginning of the Iron Age by the Dorian invaders, the founders of the Sparta of historic times. In addition to their work at this site, the English excavated the Eleusinion at Kalyvia tes Sochás, an hour and a half south of Sparta, but here nothing of importance was found.

At Tegea, Messrs. Dugas and Berchmans made a careful study of the ruins of the temple of Athena Alea, which have been laid bare at different times since 1879, and excavated to some extent north and east of the building. Their study of the temple convinced them that both the outer columns and the columns of the pronaos and the opisthodomos were Doric; that there was no interior colonnade, so that the Corinthian columns mentioned by (Pausanias viii. 45. 5) were probably half columns resting on the same foundations as the walls of the cella; and that the emendation ἐντὸς for ἐκτὸς in Pausanias' statement ἐστήκασι δὲ καὶ ἐκτὸς τοῦ ναοῦ κίονες ἐργασίας τῆς Ἰάνων (an emendation which has been largely accepted in recent years) cannot be justified. East of the temple the long foundation seven meters broad, which was dis-

covered by Milchhöfer in 1879, was excavated and found to be longer than the façade of the temple, but nothing appeared to show clearly whether it belongs to a colonnade or to the altar of Melampus, Pausanias (viii. 47. 3). On the north side of the temple, two bases for statues were brought to light. The small finds consisted of vase fragments, mostly of the geometric period, a large number of bronze ex-votos (animals, pins, rings, fibulae, etc.), and especially a very interesting archaic bronze statuette of Athena, perhaps a distant reflection of the ivory statue by Endoios, which stood in the temple and was afterward carried off by Augustus to decorate his Forum (Pausanias viii. 46).

The results of the Austrians' explorations at Elis were rather disappointing. They found few remains of the ancient city, and those, for the most part, of Roman date, or, at best, Roman buildings resting on Greek foundations. Among these, the most important are a small temple, three Roman baths, and some remains of a gymnasium, probably the gymnasium in which the athletes trained before the Olympic games. A few traces of the city walls were discovered, chiefly on the Acropolis, and a number of graves were opened, some of which contained vases of local types not known before.

At Leucas, Dr. Dörpfeld met with more success than usual in his search for traces of a western Achaean civilization. Ten new grave circles were discovered, making fifteen in all. Dr. Dörpfeld believes that a chronological sequence can be established, and that the fifteen circles point to fifteen generations of a family of rulers. The circles are from ten to fifteen meters in diameter, bounded by walls of flat stones which were originally about a meter high. Inside are hard-packed earth and stones, except for a rectangular space reserved for the grave chamber. In the grave chambers, to judge from the bronze weapons which they contain, only men were buried. The bodies of women were buried in large pithoi, and mound graves inside the circles contain the remains of children. The vases and bronze weapons in the graves are similar, in several details, to Mycenaean forms, but show, in general, a simpler culture than is suggested by the vases and bronzes of Mycenae. Stone arrow-heads and other stone implements, also, are commoner

than they are on the Mycenaean sites of eastern Greece. All this, in Dr. Dörpfeld's judgment, is as it should be. Does not Homer represent Telemachus as astonished at the splendor of Menelaus' palace?

From Italy, as usual, there is much less to record than from Greece. At Rome, Commendatore Boni excavated, on the west side of the Palatine, the grotto popularly called the "Lupercal." His most interesting finds were a number of figurines, including several terra-cotta heads of Attis. These, he believes, must have fallen down from the temple of Cybele on the Palatine, and he finds in them a proof that Attis was associated with Cybele in the Palatine shrine—a not improbable theory.

In the sanctuary of the Syrian gods on the Janiculum, where so many remarkable discoveries were made in 1908 and 1909, the excavations have been stopped, and it is uncertain when they will be renewed. The Italian government has decided to purchase the land already excavated, and take charge of any further explorations, and the conditions imposed on Mr. Wurts, on whose land a part of the sanctuary still lies buried, were such as to discourage him from allowing any excavation. Mr. Gauckler, under whose direction the last work was done in 1909, was permitted to make some soundings and minor investigations in the area already examined, but this was all. He reports that further study of the ruins of the earliest sanctuary (that of the first century B.C.) shows that it consisted of a large open temenos in two terraces, a small adyton, and a pond for the sacred fish, and that these features were retained when, in the latter part of the second century A.D., the *cistiber* Gaionas replaced the primitive edifice with a more elaborate structure. The temple of Gaionas was burnt and the whole sanctuary destroyed in the fourth century, probably as a result of the edicts of Constans and Constantius II in 341. In its place a secular edifice, consisting of porticos and a fountain, was erected, and these were incorporated in the later sanctuary, which was built when Julian restored their land to the dispossessed Syrians. These results of Gauckler's latest studies can only increase our regret that the excavations are not to be continued at once.

But, in spite of official red tape and jealousy of foreign inter-

ference, Rome is so rich in ancient monuments that every year, even without systematic exploration, brings many relics of the past to light. In arranging for the archaeological exhibition of last summer in the Thermae of Diocletian, two hitherto unknown swimming baths were discovered. They were lined with marble and filled with broken granite columns and quantities of decorated marble, stone, and porphyry. Other remains of ancient Rome came to light in connection with the removal of the Palazzo Venezia. This palace, which has long been the residence of the Austrian ambassador to the Vatican, was so situated that it would impede the view of the great monument to Victor Emmanuel, which is slowly rising on the north side of the Capitol. The Italian government, therefore, entered into an agreement with the government of Austria, whereby it agreed to remove the palace and rebuild it on a new site, some distance farther west. In laying the new foundations, some thirty feet below the modern level, numerous heavy foundation walls and a pavement of variegated marbles were found. These are thought to be connected with the Villa Publica, in which foreign ambassadors and generals who desired a triumph were lodged. In the court of the Palazzo, also, were found the ruins of mediaeval buildings (probably a part of the *monasterium S. Laurentii martiri*), in which were three sarcophagi of late Roman date.

The most striking chance discovery of the year, however, was a new portrait statue of Augustus, discovered by workmen in laying the foundations of a house at the corner of the Via Labicana and the Via Mecenate, near the ruins of the baths of Titus. The statue, which has been published with commendable promptness in the *Notizie degli Scavi* (1910, pp. 223-28, Plates I-III), is over life-size, and represents the Emperor standing, with his toga drawn over his head. Both hands are lost, so that the action of the figure is uncertain; the veiled head suggests that the Emperor was represented as *pontifex*; the *scrinium* which stands at his left side favors the interpretation as an orator. One curious peculiarity is that the head and the right forearm, which were carved separately and attached, are made of a finer, whiter marble than the rest of the figure. It is above all in the head that the hand of an able sculptor

is seen. Every detail is rendered with painstaking fidelity—the broad, intellectual forehead, the wide, mobile mouth, the long, slightly aquiline nose—and the expression of calm dignity agrees well with the character of Augustus as it is drawn by Roman writers. Whether the statue will ultimately rank as the finest extant portrait of the Emperor, as it has been called by some enthusiastic writers, remains to be seen, but the reproductions show that it deserves a high place in the series of Imperial portraits.

In regard to the *Zona monumentale* or *Passeggiata archeologica*, it is pleasant to note that the protests of which I spoke in my last report have had their effect. A parliamentary commission which was appointed to investigate the whole question met in June, 1910, and adopted a report that completely justified the protestants. The commission also passed a resolution inviting the government to introduce a law to provide for the excavation of the land comprised in the *Zona*, and rigorously to forbid the continuance of any work that might hamper excavation in the future. This means, of course, that the Romans must wait longer for the broad avenues which were the ideal of the original commission, but that when they are constructed, we may be sure that they have not buried forever important remains of the ancient city.

Finally, in connection with Rome, the formation in London of a Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies should be mentioned. The plan of organization is similar to that of the long-established Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies, and it is hoped that through the new society the British School in Rome may receive more generous support than it has hitherto enjoyed.

At Ostia, Professor Vagliari's most important find was a large block from the gateway which spanned the *Via Ostiensis* at the point where it entered the city. Many parts of this monument had been found before, including portions of the inscription, which records that a certain P. Clodius Pulcher restored the gate originally built by the senate and people of Ostia. The new fragment is about eight feet high and three feet wide, and has carved on it a female figure in high relief, with the wings spread out over the sides of the block. On her head she wears a helmet, and at her left side a shield rests on the ground. The type is similar to the armed

figure on Roman reliefs which is commonly identified as the goddess Roma, but the wings are unusual and seem to be borrowed from a type of Victory; perhaps, as Professor Milani has suggested, it is *Roma Victrix* whom the sculptor wished to portray. The style is that of the second century A.D., so that the figure undoubtedly dates from the time of the restoration of the gateway.

North of Rome, the usual number of tombs, dating from Neolithic times to the period of the Late Empire, were opened, but without any novel results, so far as I have seen. Those who are interested in the early history of civilization in Italy will find an excellent introduction to the diffuse and scattered literature in Mr. Peet's book, *The Stone and Bronze Ages in Italy and Sicily*, published in 1909.

At Pompeii, work on the new villa was resumed, and many more paintings were found, all excellently preserved. In the best examples the figures are about life-size, and many create the impression that they were copied from works of sculpture. Among the subjects are several domestic scenes—a boy reading his lesson, a woman at her toilet, and so forth—but the majority represent Dionysus and his train of Sileni, satyrs, and maenads. One especially interesting series, containing several remarkable studies of the nude and the partially draped figure, is thought to represent initiation by flagellation into Dionysiac mysteries. The reproductions of some of these paintings (in the *Notizie degli Scavi*, 1910, pp. 139–145, and Plates I–XX, and the *Gazette des beaux arts* for January, 1911) show that the early reports of their remarkable preservation were not exaggerated.

At Herculaneum nothing was done, but there are signs that the Italians are beginning to feel the responsibility they have incurred by steadily refusing all offers of help from foreigners. A writer in the *Stampa* of Turin pointedly asks why, if Italy cannot afford to attack Herculaneum, she can provide funds for work in Crete and in North Africa and for an Italian School in Athens. If such sentiments become general, we may yet live to see at least the beginning of the exploration of this important site.

Notes

Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

DID LISCUS SPEAK LATIN?

(Notes on Caes. *B.G.* i. 18.4-6 and on the Use of Interpreters)

In the *Wochenschrift f. klass. Phil.*, May 8, 1911 (No. 10), p. 500, a reviewer who signs himself H. D. is at pains to explain the joke in *largiter posse* (Caes. *B.G.* i. 18. 6; see *Class. Jour.* VI, 77 f.).¹ He admits the existence of a word-play, but thinks that I did not understand it. He says:

Aber worin liegt der Humor? Die Anwendung eines vulgären Ausdrückes ist an sich niemals humoristisch. Dieser Ausdruck aber hatte, wie ich meine, einen gewissen Beigeschmack, er ist aus dem verrufenen Ambitus entnommen. Wenn etwa Murena ein grosses Frühstück veranstalten liess (Cic. *pro Mur.* 74), so hat gewiss mancher gesagt: *Hic potest largiter* (der kann's reichlich), *scil. donare*. Diesen Ambitus-Terminus wendet nun nicht etwa Caesar auf Dumnorix an, sondern er erzählt, dass ihn Liscus von Dumnorix gebraucht habe. Also der Gallier bedient sich des bösen hauptstädtischen Ausdrückes, und Caesar verfehlt nicht das wörtlich wiederzugeben. Darin liegt der Humor.

What I said about *largiter* as a vulgar word was incidental and therefore perhaps out of place. I surely did not suppose that it would lead anyone to imagine that I regarded the use of a colloquial word as in itself humorous; still less that I considered it as making a pun. It seemed to me that it would be to insult the intelligence of the readers of the *Classical Journal* to explain, as I now do with apologies, for the benefit of foreign readers, that the pun consisted in the use of *largiter posse* in a double sense; namely, (1) *plurimum posse*; (2) *largiendo posse*. The word-play might be rendered verbally into English, "by giving largess he acquired largest powers," but the exact force of *largiter posse* in the second of the two senses in which it is used seems quite untranslatable. The form *largiter*, rather than *large*, was surely chosen because of the *i*, which is necessary for the play on *largiendo*, not because it was a vulgar word.

The citation of *Mur.* 74 in this connection is apt. Murena might well be said *largiter posse* (the addition of *donare* spoils the pun), and so might Caesar himself and many another. The suggestion, too, that *largiter posse* in this sense may have been current political slang at Rome seems by no means improbable, although it is of course a pure supposition, unsupported by evidence of any kind.

The further suggestion that it was Liscus and not Caesar who originally

¹ The remarks of the same reviewer on my note on *vela cadunt* (*Class. Jour.* VI, 75 ff.) seem hardly worthy of serious consideration.

made the pun seems a truly extraordinary one. To pun in a foreign language, and to be conversant with its high-grade slang, imply a more intimate acquaintance with that language than we can suppose Liscus to have had with the Latin tongue, even if he spoke or understood it at all. That Caesar required the services of an interpreter to converse even with that friend of the Roman people, Diviciacus, is shown by *B.G.* i. 19. 3: "Diviciacum ad se vocari iubet et, cotidianis interpretibus remotis, per C. Valerium Procillum (Troucillum?) . . . cum eo colloquitur." There is no reason to suppose that Liscus was better equipped in this respect than his compatriot; rather the contrary. It hardly seems necessary to cite authority in support of this opinion, but Mommsen, in his *History of Rome*, Book V, chap. vii (Vol. V, p. 30, of the English translation, 1900), says: "In free Gaul itself, i.e., among the Averni, the Roman language was not unknown even before the conquest; although this knowledge was probably still restricted to few, and even the men of rank of the allied canton of the Haedui had to be conversed with through interpreters." Among the "breeches-wearing" Gauls of the south the knowledge of Latin was more general, but even there its quality was not high; Mommsen (*op. cit.*, Vol. V, p. 10) says: "This bad Latin was sufficient to enable even the remote Allobroges to transact business with Rome, and even to give testimony in the Roman courts without an interpreter." But the Allobroges, unlike the Aeduans, were within the confines of the Roman province, and furthermore trade was often conducted even at a considerably later period through the medium of interpreters; see Pliny *N.H.* vi. 15: "et postea a nostris CXXX interpretibus negotia gesta ibi" (at Dioscurias in Colchis).

It naturally did not escape my notice that the words *largiter posse* occur in a passage of indirect discourse, but this passage does not report the words of Liscus, as H. D. implies, but the consensus of opinion of Liscus and certain others: "eadem ab aliis quaerit; repperit esse vera." It is in no way evident that the exact language of Liscus, or of Liscus *et alii*, is reproduced; on the contrary, the natural inference is that Caesar as usual gives in his own words the substance of what was said. I therefore had no hesitation in attributing the pun to Caesar, and I still believe that it was unquestionably his own and not a *tour de force* of Liscus in a foreign tongue. It is most probable that Liscus knew no Latin at all. We may possibly grant him a slight acquaintance with the language, but it seems quite out of the question that he should have been able to make so clever, and if H. D.'s supposition is correct, so purely local, a pun as that on *largiri* and *largiter posse*.

The use of interpreters by the Romans must have been very common from the earliest times, since Rome in her early days was surrounded by peoples which spoke languages and dialects different from Latin; and as her power was extended, she was constantly brought into contact with nations speaking foreign tongues. Yet the references to interpreters are not numerous in the literature, so far as our lexicons and handbooks may be trusted. Livy, as Professor Morgan points out (*Lectures and Addresses*, p. 14), finds it necessary

to explain how it was that the people of Fidenae could understand the words of a Roman king, but he seems seldom to mention the use of interpreters. He does tell us that the letters from Hannibal to Hasdrubal which were intercepted by Claudius Nero were read to Nero by an interpreter (*Liv. xxvii. 43. 5*), whether a professional or a Carthaginian prisoner does not appear.

Apparently the only direct reference to interpreters in Caesar's works besides the one quoted above, although he must have made constant use of them, is in *B.G. v. 36. 1*: "his rebus permotus Q. Titurius, cum procul Ambiorigem suos cohortantem conspexisset, interpretem suum Cn. Pompeium ad eum mittit rogatum ut sibi militibusque parcat"; but that they were regularly employed in dealing with the Gauls is shown by *cotidianis* in *B.G. i. 19. 3*. The use of an interpreter is implied in *B.G. i. 47. 4*, where C. Valerius Proculus (whom it is difficult to think of as a different person from the interpreter mentioned in *i. 19. 3*) is sent to talk with Ariovistus, "propter linguae Gallicae scientiam, qua multa iam Ariovistus longinqua consuetudine utebatur." Ariovistus, then, in spite of his apparent knowledge of what was going on in Rome, did not speak Latin (at least not readily) and the messages from the *nobiles principesque populi Romani* who would have been glad to hear of Caesar's taking off (*B.G. i. 44. 12*) were doubtless conveyed to him through the medium of Gallic-speaking interpreters. Probably the interchange of speeches between Ariovistus and Caesar was made in the same way. At any rate it is obvious that in the speeches of Ariovistus we have the substance of his remarks reported in Caesar's own language.

The interpreters who are mentioned by name by Caesar appear to be Romans, or more probably Romanized Gauls. Doubtless a few Romans spoke Celtic, although Caesar apparently did not at the beginning of his campaigns in Gaul, but as has been said, it is highly improbable that any considerable number of the inhabitants of Gallia Comata spoke anything more than traders' Latin. Whether the *mercatores* from whom Caesar obtained information at various times (e.g., *B.G. iv. 20. 4*), and from whom his army heard terrifying reports of the size and courage of the German followers of Ariovistus, were Italians or Gauls is not stated. In either case they probably had a slight and mainly professional command of Latin or of Celtic, as the case may be.

The references to interpreters by Cicero are more frequent. He twice refers to their employment in the Senate, in both instances as a regular thing: *De div. ii. 64. 131*, "similes enim sunt dei, si ea nobis obiciunt quorum nec scientiam neque explanatorem habeamus, tamquam si Poeni aut Hispani in senatu nostro loquerentur sine interprete"; *De fin. v. 29. 89*, "ita quem ad modum in senatu semper est aliquis qui interpretem postulet, sic isti nobis cum interprete audiendi sunt." Gellius, *vi. 14. 9*, tells us that a senator, C. Acilius, acted as interpreter for the philosophers Carneades, Diogenes, and Critolaus. In *Pro Balb. 11. 28* Cicero refers to a Greek interpreter, one Cn. Publicius Menander, and in *Ad fam. xiii. 54* to one in his own employ or

household. He twice mentions one named Valerius (*Ad. Att.* i. 12. 2 and xvi. 11. 7).

Not many of the names of the interpreters are given in full. Cn. Publilius Menander was a freedman of Greek birth, as appears both from the form of his name and from Cicero's express statement. It seems probable that in many cases the interpreters were freedmen or slaves, and that the languages which they interpreted into Latin were their native tongues. We may well suppose that their Latin, like the English of foreign guides and dragomans, was fluent rather than idiomatic and elegant. This is especially likely to have been the case outside of Italy, if, as Mommsen thinks (*Staatsr.* I. 352) the magistrates did not bring their interpreters with them from Rome.

Verres employed interpreters in Sicily (*Cic. Verr.* ii. 3. 37. 84), as the Roman provincial governors generally did. In fact Valerius Maximus tells us (ii. 2. 2) that it was a matter of principle to use them whether they were necessary or not: "quo scilicet Latinae vocis honos per omnes gentes venerabilior difunderetur. Nec illis [the magistrates] deerant studia doctrinae, sed nulla non in re pallium togae subici debere arbitrabantur." Probably their use was necessary, as well as a matter of national pride, where neither Greek nor Latin was spoken, for we know of no Roman whose linguistic equipment approached that of Mithridates the Great, of whom Pliny says (*N.H.* xxv. 6): "illum solum mortalium certum est XXII linguis locutum"; cf. *Gell.* xvii. 17. 2.

The feeling of the emperor Tiberius about the etiquette of senatorial business in this respect was strong, to judge from *Suet. Tib.* 71: "sermone Graeco quamquam alioqui promptus et facilis . . . abstinuit maxime in senatu. . . . Militem quoque Graece testimonium interrogatum nisi Latine respondere vetuit." Claudius, however, allowed the Jewish princes Herod and Agrippa to enter the Senate and return thanks in Greek for his indulgence; see *Cassius Dio* Ix. 8. This is explained by Mommsen (*Staatsr.* III. 960) on the ground that they possessed the privileges of Roman citizenship.¹

Interpreters formed a part of the *apparitores* of the magistrates and of the imperial court, and are occasionally mentioned in inscriptions: e.g., *Orelli-Henzen*, 4204 and 6319.

These notes on the use of interpreters, which make no pretense of completeness, may be out of place, like those on *largiter* as a colloquial word, but they seem justified by the neglect of the subject in our handbooks. The indices of the standard Roman histories omit the word, and the topic is treated briefly and in an unsatisfactory manner in the dictionaries of antiquities. The third edition of Smith apparently adds nothing to the article in the previous edition, and the excellent *Dict. des antiq.* of Daremburg and Saglio, usually so complete and thorough, omits the word altogether.

JOHN C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

¹ But according to *Val. Max.* 2.2.3, the custom of speaking Greek in the senate, "qua nunc Graecis actionibus aures curiae exsurdantur," began with Molo at the time of Sulla's dictatorship.

ON THE OMISSION OF THE AUXILIARY *ESSE*

The following table shows the comparative frequency with which the auxiliary *esse* is omitted, in the case of the three infinitives which it helps to form, and in the three prose authors usually read in preparation for college. The text covered includes eight orations of Cicero—Pompey's Command, the four Catilines, Archias, Milo, and Marcellus—the seven books of the *Gallic War*, and the full text of Nepos. The numbers are given in pairs, the first number in each pair indicating the omissions of *esse*, the second its use.

	Perfect Passive	Second Periphrastic	Future Active	Totals
Cicero.....	35—104	28—26	25—21	88—151
Caesar.....	74—24	72—7	116—9	262—40
Nepos.....	27—10	12—4	78—0	117—14
	136—138	112—37	219—30	467—205

Of the 79 second periphrastic infinitives in the *Gallic War*, 29 are impersonal and, without exception, omit *esse*.

The statement often found that the *esse* of the future infinitive is *sometimes* omitted is evidently no exaggeration.

The difference indicated between the three authors in regard to this omission corresponds, in a general way, to their well-known differences in style. Where there is a choice between longer and shorter forms, we should expect to find in Cicero's orations, rhetorical and sometimes ornate in character, a greater proportion of the longer forms than in Caesar's concise and unembellished history; while Nepos, in his simple, colloquial narratives, sometimes seems willing to leave out almost any word that a vivid imagination may be induced to supply.

An increasing tendency to omit the *esse* is noticeable in the *Gallic War*. The ratios for the first five and the last two books are given below.

	Perfect Passive	Second Periphrastic	Future Active
B.G. 1—5.....	43—23	38—5	79—9
B.G. 6, 7.....	31—1	34—2	37—0

A similar tendency is observable in Cicero's writings, if we may judge from the eight orations read.

	Perfect Passive	Second Periphrastic	Future Active
First six orations.....	15—83	17—22	14—14
Milo and Marcellus..	20—21	11—4	11—7

In order to see why the three infinitives differ in the frequency with which they omit the *esse*, it is necessary to consider the relative degree of ambiguity which such an omission tends to produce. The attributive and the appositive use of the perfect passive participle in the accusative forms is extremely common, and in many places nothing but a comma, which the Romans did not have, or an *et*, which they often left out, would distinguish such a use from the perfect passive infinitive, if *esse* were omitted. The accusative forms of the gerundive, on the other hand, are very rarely found, except directly after *ad* or in this second periphrastic infinitive, while the use of the accusative future participle, in the authors under discussion, is almost wholly confined to the future active infinitive. Nepos, therefore, finds no difficulty in making his meaning clear, without once using an *esse* in a future infinitive.

It may be added that since all three infinitives are almost without exception in the indirect discourse construction, the presence of some expression of *saying*, *thinking*, etc., still further reduces such ambiguity as the omission of the *esse* might tend to produce.

BERNARD M. ALLEN

PHILLIPS ACADEMY
ANDOVER, MASS.

Practice and Prospect

Edited by J. J. SCHLICHER

METRICAL TRANSLATIONS BY STUDENTS

There are readers of the *Journal* who will read no more than the title of this article. They teach poetry in their own classes, to be sure, and have their students faithfully figure out the scansion, but for the rest treat it exactly like prose. It is these teachers whose practice leads outsiders to wonder what point there is in teaching a language or a literature, anyway. For they acquiesce as a matter of course in the view that the teaching of language and literature is to be measured by the same standards, and has the same purpose, as the teaching of science and mathematics.

But it is not with such teachers that the article is chiefly concerned, except to suggest that there is another view with reason on its side, and that the writing of metrical translations by students may be a fairly useful occupation. It should hardly be necessary to point out that there is a great difference between the possession of genius in an art, on the one hand, and training oneself in it sufficiently to acquire a first-hand interest in it and to appreciate its technique and methods, on the other. And yet the first objection to metrical translations by students one would meet would be due to a confusion of these two very things.

There is really no more reason to suppose that a class of students will get the notion that they are poets from translating into verse, than that they would get the notion that they are prose masters from translating into prose. The delusion that they are poets comes most easily to those who have not been taught to look upon their work critically, as they will inevitably be brought to do when their translations are read in class and compared with those of their fellows. And the danger is exceedingly small in these days anyhow. It lies almost entirely on the other side. For anyone who has tried it knows that it takes encouragement, rather than restraint, to keep a class near the golden mean in this matter.

But, granted that it will do no harm, can it do any good to have students make translations in meter? Yes, and in several ways. First of all, it brings them to undertake a concentrated study of the ways in which the meaning of a poem or passage may be translated, such as no assignment of a prose translation is likely to secure. It leads them to exhaust the possibilities of the grammar and dictionary, but better still, when this is done, it drives them back upon their own resources for final achievement. And if, as is generally done by those teachers who have metrical translations made, the student is told to pick out his own ode of Horace, let us say, he will engage in a kind of literary comparison and discrimination from his own, purely personal

point of view which will mean more to him than any amount of discoursing on the beauties of Horace by the teacher.

From the nature of the case, a metrical translation can be made only at long intervals—possibly not much oftener than once or twice a term. Hence it represents to the student's mind a rounded whole, a completed piece of work, which is planned for, looked ahead to, and looked back to, and which is a very different thing from the work by the piece which he does, without much sense of responsibility or pride, every day. It helps to supply what is seriously lacking in our teaching of the classics—the feeling of independent achievement, which the student who does nothing but prepare assigned lessons of a certain length rarely experiences. The day when the metrical translations are read in class cannot help being something of an event; and if a number of the better ones are published in the college paper, as they should be, they will surround both student and subject with a new dignity, which may last throughout his generation. It is a disadvantage both to student and subject in these advertising days, to be compelled to admit that their work is all done out of sight. And here, at least, is something that can be seen, and handled, and talked about, by others as well as yourself. The staider brethren may shake their heads at this, no doubt, but the fact remains that the social element of any undertaking is a very important one to its success.

Another way in which the same results can be accomplished is one which Professor Calland, of Beloit College, calls his "Evening with Horace." The annual class in Horace meets at the instructor's house, together with some members of the faculty and outside friends, and the performance consists of the rendering, in costume, of certain odes, either in Latin or in the student's own translation. Sometimes they are sung or chanted to the accompaniment of music. Ode iii. 9, for instance, has been especially successful in a translation made by Prof. Calland himself, to suit the music of a duet, the "Gipsy Countess." Such an evening cannot help impressing the class, and the other guests also, with the feeling that there is an artistic way of handling a subject like Latin.

Perhaps the most valuable result of metrical translation by students is that it gives them of necessity a very personal interest in poetry itself. It breaks down the barriers of form which might otherwise keep them out, and makes them familiar with the details of its structure and its peculiar idiom, as nothing else can. What rhyme and rhythm mean is fully clear only to one who has been under the necessity of evolving them, who has gone through the whole process of selecting and rejecting, and who can at last survey the general effect and compare his work with the efforts of his companions.

Metrical translation should also be a place, and it is a place, as will be shown by the specimens printed below, where the peculiar native individuality of the student is rather more likely to break through than in an ordinary piece of routine classwork, and this itself is something which it pays a wise teacher to work for with no ordinary zeal.

The specimens of translation given below have been selected from the work of four institutions—Beloit College, Doane College, the University of Idaho, and the Indiana State Normal School. The conditions under which the translations were made were not the same in all cases. One teacher gave the class a whole term for the translation and specified a certain minimum length—four stanzas. Another had the translations made almost exclusively from the longer Odes. A third encouraged the choice of short poems, and asked for a complete translation of one of them every few days for about two weeks near the end of the term. In the selections printed, the longer poems are necessarily at a slight disadvantage, since they must be given in extract. But the general purpose will be served, nevertheless, which is to illustrate what may be accomplished and to give some of the different styles of translation by students. No one will criticize these pieces as high art, or even as faithful translations, but they will for all that be found interesting and suggestive by those who will take the trouble to read them.

Most of the translations, as one might expect, are from Horace's *Odes*. We give first several of medium length which seem to have considerable merit as serious performances.

ODE III. 9

“Whilst yet my love thy favor graced,
And no preferred youth embraced
Thy snowy neck, then I, who sing,
More honored was than Persia's king.”

“Whilst thou another hadst not wooed,
Nor Lydia after Chloe stood,
I, through thy verses known to fame,
Was honored more than Ilia's name.”

“Me now deft Chloe captivates,
On lyre sweet melodies creates:
For her I should not fear to die,
If Fate would spare my dearest tie.”

“Me noble Calais in turn
With torch of mutual love doth burn:
For him I twice should die with joy,
If Fate would spare my charming boy.”

“What if our former love revive!
Would parted lovers' prospects thrive?
Wouldst thou, were Chloe bid depart,
Regain the portal of my heart?”

“Though he is fairer than a star,
And thou than cork less stable far,
More wrathful than sea-billows high—
With thee I choose to live and die!”

—BAXTER Mow

ODE III. 13

O fountain of Bandusia,
Than crystal still more bright,
Offerings I'll bring to thee
With wine and flowers bedight.

To thee I'll sacrifice a kid,
A kid with budding horn,
Foretelling both love and strife,
At dawn tomorrow morn.

But all in vain—this playful lamb
Shall stain with crimson blood
Thy cooling streams of waters bright,
Thy sweet, refreshing flood.

The baleful star Canicula
Cannot come nigh thy rocks:
In thee delightful coolness dwells
To cheer the thirsty flocks.

O fountain of Bandusia,
Immortal shalt thou be;
Thy rocks and oaks above thee, too,
Because I sing of thee:
Thy babbling waters e'er shall leap
For all eternity.

—MINNIE WALLACE

ODE I. 22

He who is pure of life and free from sin
Needs not the bow, nor Moorish javelin,
O Fucus, nor the loaded quiver's kin
Of poisoned arrows,
Whether he goes o'er Syrtes' burning clay,
Or through unfriendly Caucas' takes his way,
Or where Hydaspes of the storied lay
Washes the shores.

Whilst in the Sabine wood, from care set free
I wandered far, and songs of Lalage
I sang, a mighty wolf did flee
From me unarmed.

No such a beast did warlike Daunia rear
In her broad oaken forest brown and sear,
Nor such a one the land of Juba fear,
Parched nurse of lions.

Place me in torpid fields where not a tree
By the warm summer breeze refreshed may be,
Which weary clime the clouds do hold in fee
And unkind Jupiter;
Place me beneath the all too burning sun,
Which homeless land mankind doth truly shun,
Still shall I love my sweetly murmuring one,
My laughing Lalage.

—JEWELL BOTHWELL

ODE I. 11

Seek not to learn what ends for thee and me
 The gods may store,
 Nor try the mystic symbols of the East,
 Showing no more.

'Tis wiser far to bear whatever comes,
 Years full or few;
 Years thick with life's rough storms, or seas
 Serene and blue.

Be wise, drink wine, nor hope for length of days,
 Bitter but sweet;
 Drink deep, nor heed the hastening end of life,
 Sad, glad, and fleet.

—J. F. HALL

Of the following we give only the beginning, as the poems are too long to quote in full:

ODE IV. 14

O lord of lords, thou mightiest potentate
 Where'er on earth the sun doth penetrate,
 What love of sires or of Quirites old
 Can praise thy deeds with fitness, or unfold
 Thy glorious triumph over all our foes
 In verses that will live, or in immortal prose.

—BESSIE BEMENT

ODE III. 7

Why wepest thou, Asterie,
 For Gyges, faithful youth,
 Who's still heart-whole in constancy,
 Who never has been false to thee,
 Why weep? Now why, forsooth?

In early spring he'll be restored
 To thee by kindly aid
 Of vernal breeze; with bounteous hoard
 Of riches he will thee reward;
 Come, dry thy tears, fair maid.

To Oricus far, far away,
 By southern winds so bold,
 Though all impatient at delay,
 He now is driv'n and forced to stay
 Till storms shall loose their hold.

—GLADYS M. DODD

ODE II. 18

No fretted ceilings, gold-embossed,
 Resplendent shine in my abode;
 No marble pillars from the South
 Support their great Hymettian load.

I do not have the wealth of kings—
 For wealth like this I have no room;
 No high-born maidens weave for me
 Fine purple gowns on Spartan loom.

—ARTHUR RICHARDSON

The next three are specimens of a lighter and more playful style:

ODE I. 8

Fair Lydia, by the gods, impart
 Why dost thou ply thine amorous art,
 And manly Sybaris seek the shade
 To languish like a love-sick maid,
 And shun the course where once he ran,
 Reckless of freckle, grime, and tan?
 He dares no more the dashing raid,
 The boldest in the cavalcade;
 Nor cares a fiery steed to sit,
 And tame him with the jagged bit.
 His precious limbs he dreads to risk
 In Tiber's waves and currents brisk;
 The anointing oil, that soothing flood,
 He shuns as though 'twere viper's blood.
 His brawny arms, once black and blue,
 When ponderous shaft or quoit he threw,
 Or took the bat, or hurled the ball,
 Or gave a punt, or tried a fall,
 Or wore the gloves, or put a shot
 (Ah, he was Johnny-on-the-spot),
 Now, soft and smooth, do gently twine
 Around his dainty Columbine.
 Why is he now like Thetis' boy,
 To dodge the fate of fated Troy,
 Close hid (for so the legend quotes)
 Concealed among the petticoats?

—MARIAN SAMMIS

ODE I. 27

The wine was made for joyous feasts,
 But do be moderate, boys;
 Don't quarrel and fight like Thracian beasts,
 And don't make such a noise.

 Some sour Falernian I, as well,
 Must drink? I will, by thunder!
 But let Megilla's brother tell
 Whose charms he's sighing under.

 Come now, own up, don't be afraid;
 You have no cause for shame.
 You'd never love a base-born maid,
 But some blue-blooded dame.

Now out with it! Well then, confess
 It to my faithful ear—
 O wretched boy, an awful mess
 You're into now, I fear.

Some kind god to your rescue come!
 You can't get out without it.
 Thessalian charms might help you some,
 Or Pegasus, but I doubt it.

—HOWARD W. BYRN

ODE II. 4

Friend Xanthias, don't hide,
 For the sake of your pride,
 Your love for the pretty slave-girl;
 Her complexion so white,
 Her blue eyes so bright,
 Would put any man's heart in a whirl.

The heart of Ajax was shaken
 By a slave-girl he'd taken;
 And Achilles was smitten that way;
 Agamemnon's heart throbbed
 For the maiden he'd robbed
 And placed in his triumph so gay,

When Phrygian bands
 Succumbed on all hands
 Before the great conqueror's might,
 After Hector, the brave,
 Struggled vainly to save
 His fatherland fading from sight.

You can't always tell,
 Her folks may be swell
 And your humble station exalt;
 She has ancestry royal:
 If the gods are disloyal,
 It surely is not her own fault.

The maid dear to you,
 So loyal and true,
 So averse to all money and greed,
 Was surely not born
 Of a mother you'd scorn,
 Whose history you'd better not read.

Don't worry, old scout,
 I won't cut you out;
 It's only her charms I'm discussing:
 An old bachelor
 Of forty or more
 Is really too old to go "fussing."

—KATHERINE MERIMAN

Current Events

Edited by Clarence W. Gleason, Volkmann School, Boston, Mass., for the territory covered by the Association of New England and the Atlantic States; Daniel W. Lothman, East High School, Cleveland, Ohio, for the Middle States, west to the Mississippi River; Walter Miller, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., for the Southern States; and by Frederick C. Eastman, the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia., for the territory west of the Mississippi, exclusive of Louisiana and Texas. This department will present everything that is properly news—occurrences from month to month, meetings, changes in faculties, performances of various kinds, etc. All news items should be sent to the associate editors named above.

Ohio

Oberlin.—Charles N. Cole, professor of Latin in Oberlin College, has been made dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and has resigned the leadership of the Latin department. His place as head of the department has been taken by Louis E. Lord, who has been promoted to the rank of professor.

Dr. H. H. Armstrong has been appointed instructor in Latin and Greek at Oberlin College.

Michigan

Detroit Eastern High School.—The Roman Senate of the Detroit Eastern High School was organized in February, 1911, for the purpose of increasing the interest of the pupils in their study of the classics. For this reason, anyone who is enrolled in a Latin or Greek class, provided he intends to complete at least one year's course in either subject and shows the proper attitude toward the purpose and work of the society, may be elected to active membership. Those also are admitted who, though no longer Latin or Greek students, have at some time in the past completed a year or more of study in either language. Although we boast a total membership of about fifty, we rarely have that number present, since we have as yet not been fortunate enough to find a time of meeting which would accommodate all. Our officers are eight in number, two consuls, two censors, two aediles, and two quaestors. A boy and a girl act as colleagues in performing the duties of these magistracies. The consuls alternate in presiding over the regular and special meetings of the Senate and in arranging the program for each session. The censors have charge of the membership roll, keep a record of the acts of the Senate, and have general financial oversight. The quaestors are the officers who handle the money and aid the censors in collecting dues and fines, while the aediles act as assistants of the consuls in preserving order, posting notices, etc. Acting with these is the faculty director, who seems to hold a perpetual dictatorship.

The Senate convenes semimonthly, directly at the close of school. A program is carefully prepared for each meeting, with the aim that it be both

entertaining and instructive. Last semester we took up a systematic course of study in Roman literature. Although the papers were carefully prepared and read by the various senators, we felt that more novelty must be introduced into our work or the original enthusiasm with which the society was greeted would die out. Consequently, we have adopted a new plan for this year. The instructive phase of our programs is to be continued by a series of talks by the different members, on the subject of Roman private life. Then from time to time we hope to present simple original dialogues or exercises dealing with incidents of particular interest to the pupil, and written in Latin, or, as was the case with the one given at our last meeting, partly in Latin and partly in English, in order to insure a better understanding of the content. Games likewise will figure largely in our plans. At the last meeting the following guessing game met with considerable success. Some ten questions were asked, similar to these: "What are men when they are tired?" "Why did our forefathers use a ladder?" etc. All present were then requested to find an answer to each in a Latin word which when spelled would translate some one word in the English sentence, but, when pronounced, answered the question. Thus, the answer to the first was found to be *viri* (weary), and to the second *noster* (no stair).

Our society is still young, just completing its first year of existence, and we are sincerely hoping that it will fulfil all the hopes with which it was founded.

Kalamazoo, Western State Normal School.—On October 5 a Classical Club was organized by the Latin department of the Western State Normal School, Kalamazoo, Mich. The object of the association is to promote greater interest in the study of the classics and to study the customs of the Greeks and Romans in a different manner than can be done in the short class period. It has been planned to have one meeting a month of a strictly literary character and another of a social nature. The boys of the Latin classes are planning to give an exhibition next spring of the Olympian games on a small scale. Inasmuch as there will be an exhibition of the Olympic games at Stockholm, Sweden, much interest is expected in the feats of the students. In a short time one of Professor Miller's dramatizations from Vergil is to be given. The departments of Expression and Domestic Arts will assist in this presentation. That the work of the second year Latin may be made more interesting, some of the boys of the manual training department are now at work on models of some of Caesar's engines of war.

Illinois

The University of Illinois.—The Department of Classics along with five other departments from the College of Literature and Arts has moved into the new and very commodious quarters provided in Lincoln Hall. These include three comfortable offices for the exclusive use of the department, three lecture-halls and classrooms, one large conference and seminar room, a library

which contains the main collections amounting now to about seven thousand volumes, and a museum for casts, photographs, and other illustrative material which will be fitted up during the coming winter. The expenditure upon this museum of something over five hundred dollars a year for the next few years, which is provided for according to present plans, will, it is hoped, add greatly to the facilities of instruction in the classics. The addition of a complete set of wall maps for the classrooms and the purchase this last summer of the full sets of a half-dozen periodicals, which were not yet in the library, might also be mentioned among the other signs of progress in the cause of classics at this university. Mr. Pease is the curator of the Classical Museum.

Alabama

Florence, Alabama State Normal School.—Professor Josiah B. Game recently resigned the chair of Latin and Greek in the Missouri State Normal School, Cape Girardeau, Mo., to accept the chair of Latin in the Alabama State Normal College.

California

Occidental College.—The Latin department of Occidental College, Los Angeles, Cal., on May 26, 1911, presented the ever-popular comedy, the *Phormio* of Terence, in an English version. The translation was made by Dr. William D. Ward, professor of Latin, and was a faithful rendering in racy, forceful English of the campus variety. The costumes also were a home production, being made under the direction of Dr. L. R. Higgins, professor of Greek. The materials used were chiefly outing flannel, canton flannel, and crepe, and cost about thirty dollars.

One scene was repeated in Latin—the scene in which Dorio, the slave dealer, appears. For this the music used was that written for the Harvard production of 1894. The repetition of a scene in Latin added much to the interest and educational value of the performance. Indeed, the whole play was followed with the closest attention and evident appreciation by the large audience present. Fortunately the leading parts of *Phormio* and *Geta* were particularly well rendered and thus contributed largely to the success of the undertaking. The scenery was painted on the campus by a local artist. It was in close accord with the customary background of the Roman stage and was quite satisfactory. Good photographs were secured of several of the characters and scenes for future reference.

Apparently one result of the undertaking has been a large increase in the Freshman Latin class of this year.

Book Reviews

The Coward of Thermopylae. By CAROLINE DOLE SNEDEKER.
New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1911. \$1.20.

The mere paucity of Greek historical novels would probably warrant a brief notice of a new work of this kind, whatever its merits might be. If this is true, the book under consideration would require a rather extensive notice, if it were to be commensurate with its merits.

The "coward," who paradoxically is the hero of the novel, is Aristodemos, the sole survivor of the band of Leonidas at Thermopylae, according to Herodotus. We are also told by Herodotus how he was hated thereafter by the Spartans because of his apparent cowardice, and how this hatred did not cease even when he proved himself a real hero at the battle of Plataea. These and a few additional statements of Herodotus furnish the main points of the story. The author has taken some discreet liberties with history, but very few in comparison with the usual historical novel, and it is very gratifying to note that she has avoided romance.

The charm and chief value of the book lie in its delineations of Greek character and life. The contrast between the spirit of Athens and that of Sparta is clearly shown, and Spartan life is admirably portrayed. The military and religious spirit of Sparta; Greek peasant life; Delphi and incidentally the methods used by Apollo's priests to obtain the prophecies from the god; the pathetic inability of the Greek city-states to band together—these are some of the subjects which are clearly portrayed. They combine to make the book a source of profit and pleasure to the young and of pleasure at least, to older readers.

EARL W. MURRAY

THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

The Essentials of Greek Syntax. An Outline of the Ordinary Prose Constructions, Together with Exercises in Composition Based on Xenophon, Lysias, and Plato's *Apology*. By CHARLES CHRISTOPHER MIEROW, PH.D., Instructor in Classics in Princeton University. Boston, New York, Chicago, London: Ginn & Co., 1911. Pp. vii + 165.

The first sixty pages of this book are taken up with statements of the ordinary constructions of Greek prose, in compact form, with one or more examples in each case to illustrate the rule, and with references to four grammars for fuller details—Goodwin, Hadley-Allen, Babbitt, and Goodell. The

Cases are presented first, followed by the Pronouns, the Prepositions, the Verb Constructions, and the Negatives. The author follows in the main the treatment as given in Goodwins' *Greek Grammar*, but in regard to the Verb has made use of the system in West's *Latin Grammar*. The arrangement is such as to show at a glance the outline of the subject. The rules are well stated; and it is only in minor details that changes are suggested. In p. 7, *ἐτιμώρησα* is less common in the sense of "punish" than the middle, *ἐτιμώρησάμην*, which is found in the passage (Xen. *Anab.* vii. 1. 25) from which this example is taken. On p. 33, § 133, attention might be called to the fact that, when the infinitive is used with *πρόν.*, it is generally in the aorist tense, as Professor Gildersleeve has pointed out. On p. 35, § 138, 3, the footnote states that in the Present General Condition an equivalent for the present indicative may be substituted; the same statement should be made for the imperfect indicative in the Past General Condition. At the bottom of p. 36, it would be helpful to have a cross-reference on *πράττη* and *πράττοι* to § 118, where the distinction between present and aorist is given. On p. 42, footnote 1, *δοκέω* is more frequently found in the sense of "seem," than in that of "believe" or "think," and takes the infinitive in that sense. On p. 59, § 247, the author follows the common statement that the repetition of the negative strengthens the negation. This was probably the case originally; but the repetition of the negative has become the normal usage in Greek, and thus has lost its emphasis. But these are comparatively small points. Following the treatment of the syntax we have about 100 pages of exercises, based on Xenophon's *Anabasis*, the speeches of Lysias and the *Apology* of Plato, constructed so as to illustrate the principles stated in Part I. These exercises are arranged in four series, indicated by the letters A, B, C, and D. Series A is taken from the first book of the *Anabasis*, series B from the second, and so on. Each series brings out all the rules of the syntactical part. A similar arrangement is followed in the sentences taken from Lysias and from Plato. There are no connected passages for translation from English into Greek, but some of the sentences are long enough to give practice in joining clauses together.

The book will be serviceable to teachers both for the purpose of reviewing the principles of syntax and as furnishing material for composition work; it will be particularly acceptable to those who desire a change from the ceaseless round in following the *Anabasis*.

G. F. NICOLASSEN

SOUTHWESTERN PRESBYTERIAN UNIVERSITY

Recent Books

Foreign books in this list may be obtained of Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 West 27th St., New York City; G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-55 West 25th St., New York City.

BURNET, J. *Plato's Phaedo*. Edited with introduction and notes. Oxford University Press, 1911. Pp. lix+158. \$1.25.

BURY, J. B. *Romances of Chivalry on Greek Soil*. Romanes Lectures for 1911. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911. Pp. 24. 2s.

CAUER, P. *Das Altertum im Leben der Gegenwart*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1911. Pp. viii +122. M. 1.25.

CUMONT, F. *Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*. Authorized translation, with an introductory essay by Grant Showerman. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1911. Pp. 320. \$2.00.

DANIELS, E. D. *A Sight Book in Latin*. Parallel Passages for Sight Translation. Boston: Sanborn, 1911. Pp. xiii+118. 50 cents.

MIEROW, C. E. *The Essentials of Greek Syntax*. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1911. Pp. vii +165. \$1.25.

MÜLLER. *Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft*. München: Beck, 1911.

SCHANZ, M. *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur bis auf Justinian*: 2 Tl., *Die römische Litteratur bis auf Hadrian*; I. Hälfte, *Die augustische Zeit*. 3, ganz umgearb. u. stark verm. Aufl. mit Register. Pp. xii+604. M. 10.

BLÜMNER, H. *Die römischen Privataltertümer*. Pp. xi+677. M. 12.

Philologische Untersuchungen, herausgegeben von A. Kiessling u. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. Heft XX. Kyrene. Berlin: Weidmann, 1911. M. 8.

PLATO. *Five Dialogues Bearing on Poetic Inspiration: The Ion, The Symposium*, tr. by Shelley; *The Meno*, tr. by Sydenham; *The Phaedo*, tr. by Cary; *The Phaedrus*, tr. by Wright; with a general introduction by A. D. Lindsay. Everyman's Library. New York: Dutton, 1911. Pp. xxii+278. 35 cents.

PLUTARCH on *Education*. Embracing the three treatises: *The Education of Boys*; *How a Young Man Should Hear Lectures on Poetry*; *The Right Way to Hear*. Ed. by C. W. Super. Syracuse: Bardeen, 1911. Pp. 192. \$1.00.

ITCHIE. *First Steps in Latin, Second Steps in Latin*. Edited by F. C. Staples. New York: Longmans, 1911. Pp. viii+164. \$1.25.

SCHWARZ, E. *Charakterköpfe aus der antiken Literatur*. Zweite Reihe. Leipzig: Teubner, 1911. Pp. 142. M. 2.20.

TERMINOLOGY of *Grammar*. Report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology (revised, 1911). London: John Murray, 1911. Pp. 40. 6d.

THIELING, W. *Der Hellenismus in Kleinasafrika*. Der griechische Kultureinfluss in den römischen Provinzen Nordwestafrikas. Leipzig: Teubner, 1911. Pp. xii+216. M. 8.

ZIMMERN, A. E. *The Greek Commonwealth*. Politics and Economics in Fifth-Century Athens. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911. 8s. 6d.